



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,073	01/10/2006	Masakazu Kawai	SAT-16451	6001
40854 7590 06/05/2009 RANKIN, HILL & CLARK LLP 38210 Glenn Avenue WILLOUGHBY, OH 44094-7808			EXAMINER DANEGA, RENEE A	
			ART UNIT 3736	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/05/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/564,073	Applicant(s) KAWAI ET AL.	
	Examiner Renee Danega	Art Unit 3736	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/11/09</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kato et al. (“The Concept of a Walking Assistance Suit”).

- Regarding claim 1, Kato teaches a method of estimating a joint moment of a bipedal walking body, comprising:

a first step for sequentially grasping the displacement amounts of a plurality of joints, including at least an ankle joint, a hip joint and a knee joint of each leg of a bipedal walking body;

a second step for sequentially grasping the positions and/or postures of corresponding rigid bodies of the bipedal walking body that are associated with rigid elements of a rigid link model using at least the rigid link model, the rigid link model being established beforehand to express the bipedal walking body in the form of a link assembly composed of a plurality of the rigid elements and a plurality of joint elements and the grasped displacement amounts of the joints;

Art Unit: 3736

a third step for grasping the acceleration of a preset reference point of the bipedal walking body by using at least an output of an acceleration sensor attached to a predetermined region of the bipedal walking body;

and a fourth step for sequentially grasping a floor reaction force acting on each leg and the position of an acting point of the floor reaction force, the grasped positions and/or the postures of the corresponding rigid bodies of the bipedal walking body, the acceleration of the reference point, the floor reaction force, and the position of the acting point of the floor reaction force being used to estimate a joint moment acting on at least one joint of each leg, wherein at least the displacement amounts of the hip joint, the knee joint, and the ankle joint of each leg that are grasped in the first step include the amount of rotation about an axis substantially perpendicular to a leg plane as a plane passing through these three joints, the displacement amount of the hip joint is a three- dimensional amount, the positions and/or postures of the corresponding rigid bodies grasped in the second step include at least the positions and/or the postures of the corresponding rigid bodies of the leg on the leg plane, the acceleration of the reference point grasped in the third step and the floor reaction force and the position of the acting point of the floor reaction force grasped in the fourth step are three- dimensional amounts, and a component of a joint moment acting on at least one joint of the leg about the axis that is substantially perpendicular to the leg plane is estimated on the basis of an inverse dynamic model representing the relationship between the motions of the corresponding rigid bodies of the leg and

Art Unit: 3736

the translational forces and the moments acting on the corresponding rigid bodies on the leg plane by using the two- dimensional amounts obtained by projecting at least the acceleration of the reference point, the floor reaction force, and the position of the acting point of the floor reaction force onto a leg plane related to the leg on the basis of a displacement amount of the hip joint of the leg, and the positions and/or the postures of the corresponding rigid bodies of the leg on the leg plane (pgs 10-12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Takenaka et al. (US 6289265).

- Regarding claim 2, Kato doesn't expressly teach finding values in the third and fourth step in three-dimensional amounts. However, Takenaka teaches finding joint moments by finding three-dimensional acceleration of a reference point, floor reaction force, and point of the acting point of the floor reaction force (Figures 1, 17) (column 11, lines 12-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method as

Art Unit: 3736

taught by Kato with the three dimensional methods and of Takenaka in order to increase the efficacy of controlled movement in a biped walking system.

- Regarding claims 3-5, Kato doesn't expressly teach determining the overall center of gravity based on joint displacement of legs. However, Takenaka teaches determining center of gravity by using displacement amounts of the joints and of the floor reaction and inclination angle relative to vertical of the ankle and toe joint wherein he determines whether the body is in a one-leg or two leg supporting state and the center of gravity exists rearward of the body when the ankle joint contacts the ground and forward the body when the toe joint contacts the floor (Figures 8, 9, 11, 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method as taught by Kato with the three dimensional methods and of Takenaka in order to increase the efficacy of controlled movement in a biped walking system.
- Regarding claims 6-7, Kato doesn't expressly teach the acting point of a reaction force as a position away downward from a specified value. However, Takenaka teaches the estimate of the vertical position of the acting point of a floor reaction force acting on a leg in contact with the ground at the toe or ankle as the position away downward in the vertical direction by a predetermined value specified beforehand (Figures 6, 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the

method as taught by Kato with the three dimensional methods and of Takenaka in order to increase the efficacy of controlled movement in a biped walking system.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 3/5/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the method is only applied to the ankle joint and not in three dimensions. However, examiner points to page 10 where Kato discloses a three-dimensional motion analyzer (lines -15-16) for leg each leg joint (pg 11) and finding moments, or rotation about an axis perpendicular to the leg of the ankle, knee, and hip joints (pg 11, line 20-pg 12).

6. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Kato and Takenaka both deal with feedback systems for controlling locomotion. Kato is robotically assisted, while Takenaka is purely robotic, however both are trying to achieve and monitor a human-like gait. Thus combining the walking measurement methods of Takenaka with Kato would have been obvious as stated above.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Renee Danega whose telephone number is (571)270-3639. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:30-5:00 eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on (571) 272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3736

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RAD

/Max Hindenburg/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736